

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-049

Complainant: No. 1279010515A

Judge: No. 1279010515B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint and found no misconduct on the part of the judge. The complainant alleged that her case was wrongfully dismissed because the judge's former law firm represented the opposing party in other cases. The commission's investigation revealed that the judge was a former member of the law firm, but did not know the opposing party. There was no evidence of misconduct.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 16(a).

Dated: June 27, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on June 27, 2006.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

Date: February 10, 2006
To: Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 West Washington
Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007

FEB 16 2006

CJC-06-049

Subject: "A Request To Vacate Judgement"

Plaintiff's Complaint: Enclosed

Defendant's Response: Enclosed

Information obtained regarding: "Arizona's Small Claims Division"

"Neither party can appeal the decision of the judge or hearing officer in a small claims case. **However, if either party believes the judgement was entered in error, or..., that party may request the court to set aside, or vacate, the judgement.** A Request to Vacate Judgement form may be obtained from the small claims clerk and filed with the court."

I made an attempt on [redacted] to obtain "A Request To Vacate Judgement" form from the [redacted] AZ Court. I was informed that they did not have it available. I now present this statement in leu of the AZ form.

REASON TO VACATE JUDGE [redacted] decision:

1. **Direct Conflict of Interest.** Judge [redacted] failed to reveal, or acknowledge in any way, her law firm's relationship with the defendant [redacted] at the time of my animal's destruction [redacted] and later...when the Small Claims Court hearing occurred on [redacted] (I did not know her relationship with the defendant on [redacted]) **JUDGE [redacted] SHOULD HAVE NEVER SAT IN JUDGEMENT ON THIS CASE.**

The first law firm that I contacted when I discovered what [redacted] had done with [redacted] was [redacted]. They told me **NOT** to discuss anything with them because it would be a **"Conflict of Interest"**. They, Judge

[redacted] firm, absolutely refused to discuss anything regarding my particular case (in the year [redacted]) since "they represented him" [redacted]

CJC-06-048

[redacted] was an astute, knowledgeable member of [redacted] [redacted] at the time of my contact with her firm in [redacted] Being a legal representative of [redacted] (as her law firm informed me they were) she, or her firm, should have also known that he was conducting business with a non-existent subcontractor making 28% to 30+ % on non-existent cremations which came through his [redacted] This is a very serious matter which should be addressed either by the Commission on Judicial Conduct or by other federal authorities...or both.

Further examination of information in this case will reveal complete rebuttal on each and every response which [redacted] presented in his written response to summons.

1. There was NO cremation performed, NO licensed Forever Friends, (the person mutilating the animals was [redacted] employee), and NO subcontractor.
2. **Four documents** provided to Judge [redacted] verifying "**written contractual agreement** (six year limit) between [redacted] and myself.
3. Constable [redacted] agreed to appear before Judge [redacted] to attest to proper delivery of summons. (Letter sent to Judge [redacted] to make this known prior to [redacted])

OTHER REASONS TO VACATE JUDGE [redacted]

DECISION:

1. The AZ Vet. Med. Examining Board found [redacted] guilty of ethical misconduct.
2. [redacted] **HIMSELF initiated the verdict by the Superior Court of [redacted]** He was the one who brought The AZ Vet. Medical Exam. Board to court as a **DEFENDANT** regarding his ethical misconduct.
3. My suit against [redacted] is for "**A Breach of Contract**" [Six year written (A.R.S. Sect. 12-548), **not oral**] which has **never been addressed** by the AZ Vet. Med. Exam. Board nor the Superior Court [redacted] **This is NOT a double jeopardy case.**

No judge should jeopardize the integrity of the position they hold. Judge [redacted] gave no justification for her decision which gives greater credence to **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**. I seek a verdict without prejudice toward either party. I request that Judge [redacted] verdict be vacated and that it be heard by a judge with NO bias, NO prior affiliation, contact, contract, superficial or legal dealings of any kind with THE DEFENDANT. If that isn't possible, then I would request that another hearing be conducted in a neutral location.

cc: [redacted]